UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Pacifism Is Needed Now - - *R. H. Ward*

Susceptibility to Propaganda - - - - - - - - - - *W. Rupert Holloway*

Peace Man or War Man - - *Will Price*

Logic, Science, and Social Progress - - - - - - - - - - *Victor S. Yarros*

THE STUDY TABLE

VOLUME CXXV NUMBER 4

Chicago, April 15, 1940

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 51
Jottings—J. H. H. 53
ARTICLES—
Pacifism Is Needed Now—R. H. WARD 54
Susceptibility to Propaganda—W. RUPERT HOLLOWAY 55
Peace Man or War Man—WILL PRICE 56
Logic, Science and Social Progress—VICTOR S. YARROS 58
On the Pacifist Front—XII 60
POETRY—
Spring—JOHN WADLINGTON 59
For Valiant Hearts—JESSIE WALLACE HUGHAN 62
On the Centennial of the United Hebrew Congregation, St. Louis, Mo.—A GENTILE FRIEND 64
THE STUDY TABLE—
A Provocative Volume—CURTIS W. REESE 63
In Honor of a Great Teacher—CHARLES A. HAWLEY 63
CORRESPONDENCE—
"The Conscientious Objector"—L. DORIS 64
Faith Proved by Works—CARL PETERSON 64
From an Old Friend—MARGARET T. OLMSTEAD 64
Tolerance—and UNITY—ERNEST R. BROMLEY 64
From a French Pacifist—D. 64
From a German Refugee—M. L. 64
THE FIELD—
An Introduction to a Pamphlet, "Peace Now"—H. RUNHAM BROWN 50

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

An Introduction to a Pamphlet, "Peace Now"

To Those Who Have Suffered Terrible Persecution, Many of Whom Are Living in Foreign Countries as Refugees

Some of you will read these pages with dismay; you will ask if we are really prepared to make peace now? Now, with the dictatorships still unbroken, with your loved ones still existing under the yoke of oppression. You will think of your own hard fate, and perhaps within the secret place of your own heart wish that the war might be carried on a little longer until it brings liberty to those who are suffering.

You have a right to blame us. We bow our heads in shame before you for our part in allowing the tragedy in your life, and in the lives of so many millions, ever to have taken place. It is so hard to look at the events in Europe objectively. What are we thinking? We would bring down totalitarianism by force of arms—perhaps in a year—perhaps in two or even three years? I think we could do it, although even that is not certain. We must increase our stranglehold. Every boy on the threshold of manhood must be flung into the combat, whether he understands what he is doing or not. Each day we must read in our paper, "Another U-boat has gone down," and think, "Another four and twenty boys gone to their doom like rats in a trap." If we refrain from bombing babies until the struggle gets fiercer, we will starve them. They will grow pale and weak and stagger. The weakest will go first—your loved ones among them. Forgive me, comrade, it must be faced.

We must put down oppression. We must win the war and then—Liberty, Fraternity, Equality? No, a dictated peace—the seeds of the next war and where shall we look for liberty? To the victor? No. Totalitarian war by its very nature must progressively destroy all liberty. What a spectacle! Europe in ruins—victor and vanquished alike overwhelmed and then a struggle for a bare existence!

Peace Now! An agreed peace—the outstretched hand—the opening of the frontiers—dropping the tariff walls. Some access to raw materials. Something left to build upon. Some hope that imperialism has been shaken—that autarchy will give place to coöperation. The dictator's stronghold not quite so strong. It all depends upon the peace. The sooner the peace, the better the peace.

PEACE NOW!

H. RUNHAM BROWN.
War Resisters' International,
11, Abbey Road, Enfield,
Middlesex, England.

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXV MONDAY, APRIL 15, 1940 No. 4

RATIONALIZATION

On reflection, however, I doubt if it is his appetite for birds that makes the cat with the yellow eyes feel guilty. If you were able to talk to him in his own language and formulate your accusations against him as a bird-eater, he would probably be merely puzzled and look on you as a crank. If you pursued the argument and compelled him to moralize his position, he would, I fancy, explain that the birds were very wicked creatures and that their cruelties to the worms and the insects were more than flesh and blood could stand. He would work himself up into a generous idealization of himself as the guardian of law and order amid the bloody strife of the cabbage patch—the preserver of the balance of nature. If cats were as clever as we, they would compile an atrocities blue-book about worms.

Robert Lynd.

ON WITH THE WAR!

It is amazing to note how frightened some people are lest the war be stopped before there is more bloodshed and destruction. In recent weeks, especially during the period of Mr. Welles' sojourn in Europe, it seemed as though we read little else but arguments and appeals against the awful calamity of ending the war now. We gathered the impression that nothing could be quite so utterly disastrous as a cessation of hostilities and the saving of countless lives from death and incalculable property from annihilation. We wonder if these alarmists over the possibility of peace ever stop to think what it is going to mean to have this war go on. Can anything in any prospect of an untimely peace be worse than the extinction of an entire generation of young men in England, France, and Germany, and the ruin of the whole structure of our western civilization? Is it nothing that London, Paris, and Berlin, to say nothing of other great and lovely cities, may be laid as waste as Warsaw? Are we to do nothing, make no sacrifices, incur no dangers, in the endeavor to save millions of peoples, in the neutral as well as in the belligerent countries, from the horrors of disease and famine? Shall we make of the whole continent of Europe a Poland? And are we so sure of victory that we can blink our eyes at the impending alliance of the four totalitarian powers—Germany, Italy, Russia, and Japan—for the conquest of the globe? If this war goes on we can see nothing but *(1)* a dictated peace by the Allies, which will be worse than Versailles; or *(2)* a dictated peace by the Reich, which will mean the military enslavement of mankind; or *(3)* universal collapse, with wild revolution rampant from Moscow to Erin. If anything in a negotiated peace today is worse than any one of these outcomes, we cannot see it. Finland stopped her war at a great price, and, whatever our regret at that woeful tragedy, we agree that she did a wise thing though it was Russia's victory. Why not the same in the larger and more dreadful war? Our mind goes back to the days of 1916 and 1917, when peace talk was in the air just as it has been this past winter. Then as now the war maniacs, themselves safely distant from the front, raged at the prospect of ending hostilities, and kept the war going to the bitter end. O, how we wish now that "peace without victory" had come in those earlier days! Must we live again to repent again of a lost opportunity of peace?

RUSSIA AND THE FINNISH WAR

If anything more were needed to convince the world of the perfidy of Soviet Russia, we have it abundantly in the peace treaty with Finland. The Communists, of course, can be convinced of nothing but Moscow's infallibility and utter sanctity; but there are others who have been clinging with a pathetic hope to their old idols, and now, alas, must give way before this final revelation of Stalin's treason to the Revolution. What was Russia's case, if we may call it such, in relation to Finland? First, that the Workers Republic, especially in the Leningrad area, was in danger of attack from western imperialists, and that the Finnish border on the Karelian Isthmus must therefore be pushed back and the military frontier thus safely rectified. But, now that the victory has been won, Russia has grabbed *all* the Karelian Isthmus, seized Hango, appropriated extensive areas in the Arctic, and extorted a concession for a railroad straight across Finland to the Swedish border. This is not defensive precautions against attack; it is imperialistic annexations of the most barefaced description. Secondly, and more important, Russia's war was described as a crusade for the liberation of the Finnish workers from capitalistic masters at home and imperialistic masters abroad. Helsinki represented everything that the Russian working class had been fighting against for years. The Finns, exploited, browbeaten, oppressed, were crying out for rescue. Indeed, had they not organized in rebellion against their overlords, a government of their

own, a "People's Government," headed (curiously enough!) by Terijoki, a Communist, resident twenty years in Moscow? Russia was unselfishly engaged in establishing this Government—it would recognize no other!—and would achieve this end though it had to slaughter the whole Finnish working class to do it. But now what has happened? Forgetting all about this war of liberation, apparently, Stalin has treated with the vile capitalistic regime in Helsinki, recognized its authority, and abandoned the workers in the diminished country to their familiar exploiters. As for the "People's Government"—it has been "liquidated." Could anything be more ridiculous? Who can believe in Stalin any more?

WHAT DO WE KNOW?

Nothing! In the most critical age of modern history, with stupendous events in every part of the world, we know just exactly nothing of what is going on. Take the Finnish war, for example! In the light of what is now being revealed, we discover that during all those months of gallant fighting, we were left utterly ignorant of the terrible losses of the Finnish armies. These losses were so heavy—now reckoned at 40,000 dead—that it was known after the first few weeks that the fighting could not go on. Yet correspondents right on the spot were speculating about the summer campaigns when the ice and snow were gone. Take Mr. Sumner Welles! Do we know under what instructions and thus for what purpose he went to Europe? Now that he has returned, have we been told even in outline what he has told the President? Has anything been said from the beginning to the end of the trip, official or unofficial, that can be trusted? In all this we are in darkness blacker than the blackout in a European city, yet Mr. Welles' mission was one which may in the end concern the lives and properties of millions of our citizens. Another example is the war in Europe! Do we know how it is proceeding? Are the Allies holding their own, or are they losing? Has the diplomatic and military initiative definitely passed to the totalitarian states, and was the French cabinet crisis the result of France's discovery that victory is impossible, and the cause of democracy in Europe therefore doomed? All this is being said behind the scenes—newspaper offices and political circles are buzzing with it—yet nothing is being told the public. We are completely ignorant of the real facts of the situation or, worse, are being deliberately deceived into believing that all is well. And so with other matters! How much are we permitted to know about the financial condition of this country—how near we are to bankruptcy and inflation? Nothing! What information do we have about unemployment and relief? Nothing! What are we told about the President's mind on the third-term issue? Nothing! We hear a lot about the awful plight of the German people in being denied all information about what is going on—these poor deluded citizens of the Reich are allowed to know nothing but what their rulers want them to know, and plaguey little of that! But wherein are we any better off? How much more does the New Yorker or the Londoner actually know than the Berliner? *How much? ?*

THE BERTRAND RUSSELL CASE

We are not happy over this case—largely because there are questions involved in it which everybody is evading. One question pertains to the College of the City of New York, which is a part of the public school system of the municipality and thus supported by the taxpayers. To what extent, if any, does this place the College in a different position from Harvard, Chicago, and other private institutions, where Russell has been given teaching appointments? Another question! Why was Bertrand Russell appointed to the faculty of C. C. N. Y.? He is a great scholar, an expert in an exceedingly advanced and abstruse field of knowledge, fitted peculiarly for graduate teaching. But C. C. N. Y. is very particularly an undergraduate institution, with a great welter of raw recruits from city high schools. The College is dominated by a terrific inferiority complex both in faculty and student body. To what extent, if any, was Russell's appointment an attempt at compensation? Was the College after a big name, regardless of all other circumstances and conditions? Still another question! To what extent, if any, is Bertrand Russell's mode of life, rather than his type of thought, involved in this controversy? Must a scholar be deemed fit to teach the young, no matter how questionable, even indecent, his character? Is there no such thing as moral influence in a teacher's relation to his pupils? What did Dr. Kingdon, President of the University of Newark, and a liberal of liberals—what did he mean when he said, in a public address, that he would have voted against Russell's original appointment, but now that he was attacked in this way would have to support him? The attack on Bertrand Russell, in other words, whatever it was in the beginning, has now become a perfectly clear-cut attack on his *opinions*. It is an insistence by reactionary church bodies that an eminent scholar should not be allowed to teach in a field of highly specialized knowledge because his ideas on certain extraneous matters were not in accord with those of ecclesiastical authority. What this claim, if conceded, would ultimately lead to, is obvious. Russell repudiated today because of his views on marriage and divorce would be succeeded tomorrow by some scholar repudiated because of his views on birth control, the higher criticism of the Bible, capitalism, or Communism. The issue as thus presented is an out-and-out case of academic freedom, and thus challenges the support of Russell by every man who values liberty and truth.

THE CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION—AND CIVIL LIBERTIES!

The American Civil Liberties Union is being criticized for its unwillingness to receive Fascists and Communists—especially Communists!—on its board of directors and on its office staff. It is accused of doing the very thing that "Red baiters" are doing in trying to drive Communists out of the country. But this shows an extraordinary misunderstanding of the issues involved. First of all, let it be noted that the American Civil Liberties Union is by its very nature a closed and not an open organization. By its name it defines itself as composed of those who believe in civil liberties. It can do its work—vindicate and defend civil liberties wherever endangered—only if its officers and directors are themselves wholeheartedly devoted to the Bill of Rights. But Communists, like Fascists, do not believe in the Bill of Rights, as witness Russia, Germany, and Italy. Of course they believe in these rights whenever they may be used to their own advantage. They do lip service, and oftentimes hand and heart service, to the cause on any occasion which serves the interest of Communists and the Communist Party. This was particularly the case in the days of "Collective Security" and the "United Front," when it was the "party line" to join hands with liberals in defense of democratic rights. But now this Front has been broken by reason of amazing events in Europe. The Communists, like their allies the Fascists, are now fighting democracy. And instantly it is discovered in this country that they can no longer be counted upon to defend the civil liberties of any persons but themselves in the party sense, and "the workers" in the non-party sense. For months the Board of the Civil Liberties Union has been handicapped, if not paralyzed, by a militant minority of Communists and "fellow travelers" who would tolerate no action for civil liberties which was not in their own immediate interest. What was the Union to do in such a predicament? Surrender to its minority, and therewith become an adjunct of the Communist Party? To have done this would have been to betray its own cause—exactly as though the American Council Against Intolerance, in demonstration of its own tolerance, were to allow its affairs to pass into the hands of Father Coughlin and the Christian Fronters. There are some things which are elementary, and among these is the principle that a crusade or a cause shall be in the hands of those who believe in it.

AT A LUNCH COUNTER

She was as pretty as a picture. We first noticed her, of course, for her lovely face. Then we saw her hat, which was a most becoming felt trimmed with fur—and it was several days after Easter! We looked out upon the street, and watched the fantastic spring hats prancing by—ridiculous straws, perked and pointed ribbons, and little gobs of flowers tipped down over the right eyebrow—but not a sign of fur. This pretty girl was independent, and thus refused to be the slave of seasons. We looked at her now with unfeigned admiration, when suddenly we saw her lift her hand, and—what was this? Fingernails as nature made them? Was it possible?—no bloodstains, no ruby smears, no pinkish paints? It was true!—this girl had never touched her nails to make them ghastly as with raw flesh. We were getting interested now, and began looking a bit more carefully. Eyebrows!—No, this girl's had never been plucked. They were heavy and dark, shadowing deeply her lustrous eyes—a distinctive element in her bewitching beauty. Her lips!—they were red, but not glaringly so; they seemed to be natural, like a baby's. Her cheeks!—they were flushed a lovely rosy tint, but apparently not by paint without but by the warm currents of life within. We'll wait till she finishes eating, we said, and then we'll see if she sets up her toilet kit upon the counter and bedaubs herself, like some jungle savage, with makeup. But no!—when the meal was done, there was no lipstick, no powder puff. Then, almost with terror, we watched again. Would she smoke? These were anxious moments, for the girl was lingering over her finished meal, and now and again looked into her handbag. But no cigarette appeared. At last she rose, and turned, and—wonder of wonders, we saw that her hair was long, uncut and uncurled, just gathered in a tidy knot about her exquisite neck, like Psyche in the sculpture. What a girl was this! Not an artificial touch upon her! No touch could make her lovelier than she actually was—and she knew it! So she defied seasons, and ignored fashions, and remained her unspoiled self. Which convinces us that all the painting and powdering, clipping and curling of our day spring from an inferiority complex in modern women. These women have lost confidence in themselves. They are demoralized and frightened, and therefore rush to artificial aids to save them. What's the matter?

Jottings

Everything comes to him who waits—and *works!*

Every now and then we see pictures of riots. Frightened crowds and fighting police; men and women running, or sprawled in the street; disheveled clothing and bleeding heads; anger, hate, violence. And in the midst the horses of the mounted police! These animals are invariably calm, dignified, admirably disciplined, and perfectly behaved. And we know what Jonathan Swift meant when he wrote about the land of the Houyhnhnms!

The English have spent millions of pounds in building the *Queen Mary,* the *Queen Elizabeth,* and the

Mauretania, finest passenger liners in the world—and now these vessels are being used as troopships. That's what our civilization has come to!

Prayers for peace were offered at the Good Friday services in the churches of France, according to the Associated Press—but peace "only after victory over Germany." In other words, God as well as Hitler must come to terms with France. A Versailles peace in heaven!

America can starve the war, or feed the war. We are now feeding the war, and thus doing our part to keep it alive. Why not feed peoples everywhere, the unemployed at home and the refugees abroad—and let the war go hang?

Did you know that "Soviet Russia respects the sovereignty of small countries"—that "in numerous convincing instances the Soviet Union has shown itself to be the noble friend of small countries"? That's what the Moscow *Red Star* says, as quoted by the New York *Times.* We wonder if one of the "numerous convincing instances" was Finland!

J. H. H.

Pacifism Is Needed Now

R. H. WARD

When we begin really to look at life, we are carried beyond its superficial circumstances of war to others that are intangible, but nevertheless very potent.

The superficial circumstances of war are bombs, submarines, guns, and the damage to life and property that these do. But these things are not the whole of war or the only kind of it. If we examine a stratum of life less obvious, we shall find war being waged there as well. For instance, the economic and commercial stratum is in a state of war, and was in a state of war long before the political stratum came to grief and the bombs and guns appeared (or, as we say, "war broke out"). The field of commerce is a battlefield, and one far more ruthless, lawless, and unmoral than the battlefield of which we usually think. For money, and the power it represents, the most merciless crimes are continually being committed; the brutal effects of a deal in the commercial world are far further reaching than those of a torpedo that sinks a mere handful of human creatures. And if we penetrate one layer lower, to the social field, that also is a battlefield; there the class war is waged, the war of snobbery and social jealousy, and it too is ruthless and utterly selfish; on that plane there is no quarter for the vanquished or for those who are wounded or taken prisoner. We can see this war going on in small matters all around us: the rivalry over the garden fence about the respective merits of this year's hollyhocks; Mrs. Jones has a new motorcar and Mrs. Smith who lives next door has to have one too, and a better one, in order to outdo Mrs. Jones. These are trivial examples, but very real ones.

We are getting nearer home. The process of critically examining the social order in which we live is an increasingly painful one, but it has to be gone through, like other pains, if we are to come out into health and sanity. It is painful because it brings us to the point at which we have to examine ourselves; and that always hurts, so that we always escape it if we can. For the next stratum is that which is inside our own homes; it concerns itself with our own intimate personal relations. And these, we have to admit, are war relations also, no less than international ones. Which of us who is honest can avoid admitting warfare between himself and his close associates, those with whom he works in his office, his brothers and sisters, his parents or his wife? If there is no warfare under our own roof (and it need not be very noticeably explosive to be warfare still) we are rare and lucky beings.

But there is one further step to be taken in this journey downwards from the sphere of international warfare, through the other battlefields of which we usually never think, to the personal battlefield: that step brings us to our individual selves and the warfare which is going on within us. This is the sphere at which it is hardest of all to look and from which, if we possibly can, we turn tail and flee. The moment we begin to realize that we are ourselves implicated in responsibility for the various wars that are ceaselessly being waged, we look for an escape; we look for a scapegoat and try to fix the blame on it in order to salve our own consciences. It is then that, looking at our warring world, we decide that the blame lies with the government, or the Church, or Hitler, or the capitalists, or even the BBC or the newspapers. But it is we who put the government in power; the newspapers are as they are because we read them, and the men who make money out of them know well enough what we like to read. If we get rid of one government and put another in power the disgraceful state of affairs, though its accents may perhaps be changed, still remains disgraceful. We may unload our sins on to the scapegoat and shoo him off into the wilderness, we may blame this or blame that, condemn this or condemn that as the cause of social evils (war included), but it makes no difference, the evils still persist.

As a means to lead people to the understanding of whence wars proceed, ("out of the heart") propaganda of the noisier sort is excellent; but propaganda must not stop there. The greatest of all methods of propaganda is, again, the art of life, or what is sometimes called propaganda by example. A man can only act according to the condition of his inward being; he can only live peacefully if he has peace within himself. It is by our actions that others decide whether we are "right" or "wrong," "good" or "bad," and whether what we preach is "good" or "bad," practicable or impracticable. You may preach pacifism till you are blue in the face, but no one who knows that you will beat your wife when you get home is going to be deeply impressed or persuaded to become a pacifist too.

It is far less because of what he said than because of what he was and did that we are moved, even two

thousand years later, by the idea of Jesus. (It is strange to reflect that, although he did it, we do not think very readily of Jesus preaching to the multitude; we remember him rather as the man who cared for the woman taken in adultery, as a man whose best work was done on intimate and personal terms.)

So much concern with the individual is only one step towards concern for the community. Not until a man is inwardly integrated is he fit to be reintegrated into the community and to play his rightful and peaceful part in it.

A man who is peaceful in the true and inward sense, not only in the loudly verbal and outward (on platform) sense, cannot fail to carry on propaganda by example. He is like a stone thrown into the pool of his own surrounding society; no one can tell how far the spreading ripples of his influence may carry, who will be moved by them, how many will be changed by them. For it is only when we doubting humans see the tangible results of what a man preaches that we begin to be impressed and to wonder if, after all, he is not right.

A greater and firmer step towards international peace is taken when one man sees that another has love in his heart and his actions, and thus aspires to be like him, than is taken when a thousand hear another preaching peace, and go away forgetting what he has said. The making of peace is a process of small and painful steps, not of mass conversions.

We all long for a quicker and easier way than this; we all grudge time his revenges, and look for a universal panacea that will change the world in the twinkling of an eye. But the world is what we make it; its condition depends on the condition of the men who walk upon it; and our present condition is one of war.

Just as we have no right to be surprised that wars break out between nations, we have no right to believe that any hasty and superficial treatment of world conditions, any political expedient or economic readjustment, can bring them to an end. These political and economic readjustments can only come when there has been an adjustment at a lower level, and as the result of a state of mind in the majority of human beings that will bring them about inevitably.

You cannot cure measles by treating the rash, even though it is the most obvious symptom of the disease: the whole body has to be brought back to health; then the rash will disappear. The application of these methods requires time, a very long time. We need not think that we shall achieve peace in our time, or indeed for very many centuries; this is depressing but true. Other methods that do not go so deep have failed and must fail; they have no roots. Peace can only be made by peacemakers. There is no shortcut to the Kingdom of Heaven, and although that Kingdom is within ourselves, the journey to it is the longest journey of all.

Susceptibility to Propaganda

W. RUPERT HOLLOWAY

A lot of emphasis is being placed today on the power of propaganda. One of our anxieties in a democracy, in America, is that other countries, the European nations, will use propaganda to get us into the war. Propaganda in the news is suspected. Recently the French parliament has been excited at the fact that a survey of American newspapers and periodicals reveals an over-preponderance of Nazi propaganda; the French cause, it is asserted, being very poorly represented. The French decided to be more hospitable to reporters, that they might have a better share of the space in our American press.

It is difficult sometimes to distinguish between news and propaganda. What we know is that we cannot escape propaganda. It is almost in the air we breathe. No civilization had our modern spread of printed matter, or our radio communication. Powerful organs for the utterance of opinions are the product of science, and we are all under the influence of these purveyors of suggestion. We are constantly being subjected to semi-hypnosis, in which our intelligence is put to sleep and our power of choice is made inoperative. Every advertiser knows the technique of influencing people; emotional appeal is at the bottom of the method. Those who have studied modern advertising have discovered that it relies largely on an appeal to fear. Hitler used it successfully. Religion has not been innocent of that sort of propaganda.

We are easily exploited today by those who can gain the use of these large-scale methods of influencing opinion. The magazines that flood the bookstands are filled with the productions of the propaganda machines. These extraordinary advertisements hardly ever tell the plain truth; they do not rely on facts; their intention is to induce us to buy this particular brand of toothpaste, or this type of automobile. Consumers cannot trust these plausible inducements; and we know that certain groups of persons are today eager to educate people on the question of getting their money's worth. When democracy, however, recently tried to get legislation protecting the people of the country from impure foods and drugs, the producers of these articles enlisted the editors of magazines and the propaganda machinery to fight against the need of truthful labels.

In considering this matter of propaganda, we must put stress on a factor that has almost been ignored. We can very easily lay the blame on those who, we assume, are intending to sway our minds and our wills. We can whitewash ourselves very easily. Yet every person would agree that the public itself is gullible, able almost to swallow anything as long as it is wrapped up in a decent covering. The vendor of cure-alls, the medicine doctor at the country fair, knows as Barnum did that a fool is born every minute. The public, it is said, likes to be cheated, if the job is done cleverly. Recently in New York, where a splendid fight was made on racketeers, public enemy No. 1 was the gullible citizen who sided with the criminals against the law. What we have not stressed is the "blind spots" in people's minds. One of the chief blind spots is ignorance. A person ignorant of chemistry is not likely to be much concerned about the insidious way in which his food is poisoned. A vivid campaign to arouse him out of his stupor of indifference has to be waged by those sufficiently informed, who care a good deal about the public weal; a process that the sleeper does not like, for he much prefers to "take it easy."

Propaganda relies for its success on the way we are

easily influenced. We may be above group hysteria and mob psychology and yet be wide open to a thousand bad influences. A plain invitation to become a crook would tempt few human beings; our minds repel that sort of influence because, by social influences and example, our minds are full of honest images. We know that the arm of the law is longer than a crook's arm. We are fortified by the fear of prison as much as the love of decent living. We realize that a criminal's life is a dog's life. Yet we can be excited by propaganda to hate and destroy, to solve problems by force instead of law; that is one of the ethical enigmas of civilization—in our own group we appeal to law and peaceable methods, beyond our frontier we rely on methods of a contrary kind. We are both law-abiding citizens, and citizens beyond the reach of law. We can be swept into states of mind in which we regard the citizens of another country as worthless or inferior beings, and feel self-righteous in so doing.

We all have blind spots. We are all over-susceptible to propaganda. If we are to distinguish between propaganda and science, which is the real distinction to be made, we can readily see that one relies on an appeal to the emotions, and the other on an appeal to the intelligence. There is, in this analysis, in this sharpening of a distinction between two states of mind, nothing of an over-statement or an under-statement of the case. We are aware that an emotional appeal wraps itself up in a pseudo-rational covering. Advertisements that rely on scaring the "prospect" into a receptive condition are apparently appealing to the reason. We know, also, that in any scientific judgment there is an emotional basis. Nevertheless, all of us recognize the difference between a state of consciousness in which fear is uppermost, and one in which caution rules; or a condition of mind in which the appeal is to jealousy and one in which the response is to curiosity as to the facts involved in a given situation. When the ardent Nazi in Germany swallows the propaganda about racialism and his own superiority, he is infatuated with an idea that exalts himself at the expense of others. When the anthropologist examines the evidence for myths about race, he is certainly in a very different state of mind. A civilization in which self-love is exalted above the love of truth is built on sand, and propaganda is its favorite food. Such a society favors myths as its binding power.

The scientific attitude to life, the fact-finding and experimental method, the skeptical approach which admits the possible presence of error in any accepted truth: this approach is too modern as yet and too removed from the popular prejudice and emotionalism; it is restricted to the laboratories. The average mind is full of blind spots, is easily fooled, and has quite a stock of moralistic rationalizations. We may become scientific-minded in politics and economics, but *when* nobody knows. That is our hope, not our assurance.

Peace Man or War Man*

WILL PRICE

I am a Peace Man, the child of a long line of Peace Men; men who, when they suffered from aggression, suffered without thought of reprisals; and I am sick to my heart of the banal bellowings of the war dogs, the War Man claiming all patriotism, all courage, all protection of helplessness, all wisdom and righteousness. Pointing the finger of scorn at the peace-loving, bawling out at their reasonable and sane protests against war and the preparation for war, which IS war, these self-styled "brave men and patriots" brand as molly-coddles and cowards all Peace Men whom they do not excuse as well-meaning idiots. Back into their teeth I fling their appellations if not their taunts. Cowards! Physical cowards! Which is the coward, the man with the gun, or the man who faces his fellows for the right without the gun? The gun men are the ones who fear. They proclaim it; they fear invasion, they fear outrage to their families, and loss of their liberties, not to mention loss of their wealth. The war spirit is built on fear. They seize this red hour to cry aloud their own fears, to breed fears in others. They buttress their fears with history, carefully neglecting the history of peace and the triumphs of peaceful methods. They talk with utter scorn of "peace-at-any-price traitors." The price of peace has never been fully discovered for the lack of faith and experiment. But the price of war! We know that, although the War Men gloss over its hideous count; the price of war is the sum of all conceivable crime, murder, theft, lust, arson, rapine, calculated murder, underhand murder, the murder of the few by the many, where possible—for that is "good tactics." Its glory is the glory of better guns, of more guns, of achieving, through clever deception, the glory of being wise enough where possible to have twice as many men as your enemy at a given point.

Your War Man asks your applause because he "goes out to lay down his life for his country." That is a lie. He goes out to lay down the other man's life for his country. He is a good soldier in proportion to his ability to lay down other men's lives and preserve his own. I am not talking about the adventurous spirit of man that makes him seek mortal danger. That is so common in the daily walks of peace as to be taken as a matter of course. Why, even for sport and gain, men take the chance, and glory in it. Look at the casualties of speedway and aviation fields. The daily service of our reckless productive industries leads men and the women and little children, whose protection is the proudest and loudest boast of the War Men, into continuous and frightful dangers to health and life. Powder making is pretty nearly as dangerous as powder burning, and the quarry and mine take their toll of life as insistently as war, and no flag draped over the bier!

Always the War Man harks back to the protection of the weak and helpless, of the old, and of women and children; but he forgets it is the War Man, as a War Man, who commits the horrors he fears. The War Man at home is perhaps a good father and good citizen; but, mad with the mingled joy and shame of the bayonet, hunted himself as well as hunting, his eyes and soul red and seared with the loosened morals of war, he takes his toll of murder, lust, and rapine. The glory

*This remarkable article was written in 1915, and published that year by the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends. It is as true, and as much needed, today as ever—and is therefore republished here with due acknowledgments.—*Editor.*

of all sacrificial war can never wipe out the horrors that stalk inevitably in its train.

Fearing that his murderous tools, his mad courage and his treacherous strategies are not enough, the War Man cries aloud to a god of war to make more efficient his murderous work and to damn with weakness and death and loss of liberty his enemy, whose ascending or descending prayer mingles with his own in the confused mind of his muddled deity. The War Man even cites the gentle Man of Galilee, acquainted with enough of sorrows and of grief without the perversion of His picturesque, oriental figure of speech: "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I am come not to send peace but a sword." Knowing how men twist and wrangle over the simple and direct gospel of love, He prophesied what those would do who forge the sword in the name of the Prince of Peace. But He too was a mollycoddle. He turned the other cheek. He did good to those who despitefully used Him. What War Man ever had the courage to be nailed to beams of wood and swung agonized into the shameful air of a Golgotha, crying out "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do!" And where was the War Man that day? Fighting with his protective weapons for the weak, the persecuted, the tortured? Oh, no! The War Man ringed Him about with steel to hold off the hands of pity and of love, and calloused to such work by war and its executions, drove the rending nails through those tender hands that had never held anything more threatening than his carpenter tools and "a scourge of small cords" with which, as a symbol, he had driven forth the money changers from the temple. Pretty frail links these, with which to bind the preacher of the sermon on the mount to the chariot wheels of war. But the War Man, or the war part of man, still sneers at that power which He held up as the world-saving power—the power of Love, which is the power of righteouness, which is the power of justice and of truth. To him, those names are not the names of powers, but the shameful names of weaknesses.

And you, "priests of Christ," War Men at heart, where is your faith in the power of righteousness and of God? "Oh ye of little faith." Little faith! Of no faith at all, not even as a grain of mustard seed! That faith is no faith that holds up one hand to God and grips the sharpened steel of murder under cassock or stole. What mountains of hate do you hope to move with such a lever? What protective bulwark of love do you hope to throw up with such a tool? Priest and War Man join voices in the cry, "Be prepared. The world has gone mad; be mad yourselves. The dogs of war are rabid; turn loose your mad pack that you may meet them on their own ground." Coward priest and coward War Man, who would saddle on the back of the world's hope for peace the dreadful and dangerous menace of "preparedness"; who would train our young men and children away from the power of the spirit to the feeble and uncertain power of the armed hand. Go read that history to which you point, but read it ALL. Look at your undefended coasts, not in the light of what might happen were men base enough, but in the light of what has happened and what has not happened. Look to that more than three thousand mile imaginary line that separates us on the north from England's power, our most vulnerable border, and between us and whom in one hundred years of peace we have had the most frequent and most bitter bickerings—not a fort on its three thousand miles, not a warship on its inland seas, only the power of a righteous agreement made by the mollycoddles of one hundred years ago, when we not only failed to build defenses, but actually disarmed, allowing the great hulks of warships then building to rot on their crumbling ways. Folly? Yes, the divine folly of faith and brotherhood, and its results show in the proven power of good will.

"Yes," the War Man cries, "but they are our blood brothers." That explanation withered in the fierce fires of '61. "But their civilization is the same as ours." "If other men were like us, there would be no need of preparedness." That road leads a weary round. They all say it. "But look what happened to Belgium* because she was not prepared." And I fling it back as history: Look what happened to Belgium because she was prepared. "But," your logical War Man answers, "she wasn't prepared enough." That is a bottomless pit. Who can be prepared enough? "Each must be stronger than any." That is the reasoning of a wry-necked owl, which cannot see by God's light. Belgium was proportionally more prepared than we may hope or fear to be. Her courage was as high as any, her self-reliance and heroism as generous, her protective love as fierce as the world has seen. But the War Man has ploughed her sunny fields and harvested her life. "But shall she not be reinstated and avenged?" What is there to reinstate but the war-torn remnant of a people, very glorious even to me, my brother War Man? But the seed of hate has been sown, and the flower of hate is more hate, and poverty and sickness and weakness, and in a little while death.

Even the War Men, most of them, admit that if we could all be civilized there would be no need for war. It is only the savagery of others that makes it necessary for us to be savage; and, our honor must be preserved abroad. As if our honor were in another's keeping than our own!

Well, we Americans have another chapter of history that has something to say to the dulled ears of strife. There is Pennsylvania; and here I am on my own ground. I know that history from within as well as from without, and if I cannot share the light of that inner conviction of the power of truth and peace that has been the strength of Quakerdom, at least I can point the War Man to the facts. For sixty years—another goodly slice of our brief history—so long as the policies of Penn were maintained, there were but two Quakers killed or injured by the savage Indians. And note these two cases, War Man. Call them coincidences if you will, but note them. One of them was a woman who at a time of strife between the Indians and the armed whites, who hemmed the Quakers in, took fright, and, trying to creep into a blockhouse, was killed by the Indians; and the other was a Quaker man who on a similar occasion, getting the coward's faint heart, took a gun with him to his plowings and fell in his preparedness. Of course, the Indians could not know them for Quakers, for the Quakers neither carried guns for the aggression of armed defense, nor built forts nor refuge for their fears. When I was a little boy, my mother told me tales her grandmother had told her—tales of Indians, and how the Quakers used always to leave their latch strings out in winter so that the Indians could come in on cold nights and sleep beside their hearths. "Cowards," those men, to leave the doors open to savages and sleep soundly, trusting

*Poland (1939)!—*Editor.*

their innocent wives and children to the mercy of savages, protected only by their faith in their fellowman and the power of their own love and friendliness. There are and have been Quakers who have fought, but they were not Quakers any more than those are Christians who would bolster up the Kingdom of Christ with sword and flame and call His words to witness they do it in His name.

I do not call on you to become Quakers, or even non-resistants. That call is from within. But I do call on you to sanely look at the path of peace and its dangers and difficulties and rewards, and on the path of preparedness for war, which is the path to war, and compare its certain dangers and difficulties and rewards. There is in each of us the War Man and the Love Man, the enemy and the friend, and we grow confused and think the War Man is the Love Man, and so sharpen our defensive tools in the name of love. And for thousands of years we have trusted and given sway and dominion to the War Man in us, placing to his credit most of the accomplishments of the other side, the constructive, brotherly side of our nature. But slowly the Love Man conquers. Gradually and fitfully we have been giving him our trust. Unconsciously we have accepted and proven out the power of faith in men and in righteousness. No longer does every man carry a weapon of defense. Our countryside and our cities are more orderly and more safe than when great garrisons of War Men kept the streets. Already, without knowing it, we keep our order through friendliness and trust in each other, rather than through force. Even our policeman has become a directive and kindly force, rather than a mere order keeper. His white glove rather than his club, has become his symbol of power.

And now, while the world is at war, is the time to show our courage, not by following that gruesome lead, but by daring to stand for the power of peace. Now, while the soul of man is horrified with the purposeless and useless slaughter, would be the most effective time in the world's history to declare faith in man. It is only governments that make war, not peoples, unless the people have been systematically corrupted by governments in the name of education and patriotism. Now is the time to declare that government of the people, by the people and for the people is self-government, not the government of others; and that its base, and only hope, rests on self-control unterrified by the threat of violence on the part of others, secure and safe in the consciousness of the good will that breeds good will, even in savages.

The German people, not the government, believe in their own souls that they are fighting against aggression and for their firesides. They are not a people of conquests, whatever dreams their rulers have, and they are made to fight by that belief only. And so it is with the Englishman, and the Frenchman, and the Russian man. Even the seed of racial hates engendered by past wars and aggressions would not drive them to war but for the tales they are told of outrage and aggression.

But the War Man would have us build up armies and navies in the name of peace, in spite of the terrible results of preparedness! In this war a preparedness vaunted by the most prepared as the best possible guaranty of peace—a preparedness that it took forty years to build up and will take forty more to pay for—made inevitable the greatest war of history. And who pays for preparedness and the wars that result from preparedness? Is it those who cry out for armament and compulsory military training? Never. It is the common people, those who pay nearly all of the taxes and spill nearly all of the blood; not the strenuous and loud-voiced War Men who see themselves as officers and heroes, whose idea of maintaining their honor or their country's honor is to kill some one who did not commit the offense. That is war.

The danger of preparedness is preparedness. You cannot train men to play football and keep them trained without their at least wanting to play football.

When the War Man cries out, "To arm is for the sake of peace," he either lies or is blind to history and human nature.

Inscribed on the blade of an ancient sword are found these pregnant and prophetic words: "There is never peace with me, and my desire is always for war."

Logic, Science, and Social Progress

VICTOR S. YARROS

An attentive re-reading of Professor John Dewey's book, *Logic*—and that work is eminently vital and relevant at this juncture in human affairs—cannot fail to raise certain questions in the minds of those who are particularly interested in the widest and most earnest application of scientific canons and scientific propositions to contemporary economic, social, and political problems. To be sure, few are naive enough to believe that science alone can save civilization and insure steady progress toward a nobler and better social order. Man possesses intelligence, and that intelligence has enabled him to develop science, art, and philosophy; but the *use* of science does not depend on intelligence alone. Man, in the words of Aristotle, is the "most unholy and savage of animals" when he employs, as he so often does, his intelligence for evil and anti-social purposes. Social progress is essentially moral progress, and good will is a prerequisite, an indispensable condition of moral progress.

What ails our so-called civilized societies? Why does catastrophe threaten us? Are we too ignorant to solve our problems reasonably and humanely? Professor Dewey, in a remarkable introduction to his book, directs our attention to the striking paradox in our civilization—namely, that

> . . . in the techniques which affect human use of the materials of physical nature in production, science has become a powerful agency of organization. As far as issues of enjoyment, of consumption, are concerned, it has taken little effect. Morals and the problems of social control are hardly touched. Beliefs, conceptions, customs and institutions whose rise antedated the modern period still have possession of the field.

But why is our civilization a house divided against itself? Why is science welcomed and utilized in certain fields and cold-shouldered in others?

These two queries naturally suggest another: What can we do to facilitate and bring about the cheerful and systematic use of science, and *of its spirit* in the fields of morals and economics?

Professor Dewey makes no attempt to answer these pertinent and crucial questions. He may have considered them to be somewhat beyond the scope of

his work on logic. But he makes a few observations which are bound to perplex the thoughtful reader and which require elucidation, especially in view of the fact that, as they stand, they throw some doubt on the validity and soundness of his basic conception of the *rôle* of science and the scientific method in social reconstruction.

What, according to Professor Dewey, is required by modern logic, or by "the valid scientific theory of social inquiry"? This—"complete acceptance of the status of theoretical conceptions as *hypotheses* which have a *directive* function in control of observation and ultimate practical transformation of antecedent phenomena, and which are *tested* and *continually revised* on the ground of the *consequences* they produce in existential application." [Italics mine.]

This statement seems unchallengeable at first blush. But a little reflection will suggest the need of some reservations and qualifications, so far, at least, as the social sciences are concerned. Professor Dewey tells us, with the aid of illustrations that hardly *any* existing school of social reform, or any social inquiry animated by a desire for social reform, observes and fulfills the above-mentioned indispensable conditions of scientific procedure. The classical school of economics, the Marxian school of Socialism, and other schools are equally guilty of prejudging "the characteristic traits and the kinds of actual phenomena that the several plans of action are to deal with." Logically and scientifically speaking, we are told further, there is no such issue as laissez-faire versus government intervention, or individualism versus collectivism. The "theory that all social phenomena are to be envisaged in terms of the class conflict between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat," Professor Dewey affirms, is by no means warranted or supported by the kind or amount of evidence which modern logic demands. And we are admonished to bear in mind the all-important truth that, apart from the admittedly greater complexity of social phenomena, "there is no difference between the fruitful methods of science in the physical domain and those in the social realm."

Let us apply these propositions.

Many people believe that the present economic system, called capitalistic, is bankrupt, sick unto death, and that it will, in all human probability, be superseded or succeeded by *some* form of collectivism. Obviously, this is at present only a tolerably respectable hypothesis. This hypothesis, like all others, has a directive function, and should be tested and re-tested and continually revised on the ground of the consequences it may produce in existential application. But, unfortunately, this directive function is impeded gravely and in every quarter by persons whose vested economic interests would suffer under any form of collectivism. Controlled observation of collectivism thus becomes impossible. The hypothesis, therefore, cannot be tested by any fruits.

Even the short steps that have been taken, or are being taken, toward the collectivist system here or there cannot be properly tested and re-tested in accordance with the dictates of logic. Life is not a neat laboratory. There are always powerful groups or interests which either oppose the organization of new tests or else refuse to accept the verdicts of such tests as are found feasible. In the social sciences no conclusion ever finds universal acceptance. Macauley observed that if the discovery of the circulation of the blood had threatened anybody's pocket, it would have been stubbornly opposed. And Hobbes had said that only such truth is welcomed as "opposeth no man's profit or pleasure."

In social reform we cannot insist too vigorously on full compliance with the demands of logic. We must perforce be guided by hypotheses.

What is the truth about T.V.A.? What are the facts regarding the operation and the results to date of the Wagner Labor Relations Act? Have the Referendum and Initiative justified or disappointed the hopes and expectations of the pioneer advocates of those democratic devices? It is notorious that upon these and similar questions in the social and political realms there is no agreement or the likelihood of agreement. Prejudiced men are seldom impressed by evidence. Angry and resentful men do not recognize the writs of reason and fact.

How much intellectual honesty is there in our political and economic discussions? How many of our corporation lawyers, our plutocratic newspapers, and our big industrial lists are desirous of bringing the truth to the masses and enabling them to reach independent and intelligent judgments?

These questions answer themselves. There seems no escape from the conclusion that we must resign ourselves to social action, to reform legislation, in the light of rough judgments, urgent needs, and mere theories.

We cannot seriously blame Marx, then, for his revolutionary activities on the ground that he had not sufficiently tested and re-tested his theories. Nor can we quarrel with those who take part in the discussion of such issues as laissez-faire versus government control, or capitalism versus collectivism. We cannot wait for logical and scientific perfection in the formulation and submission of social issues. Hunger, misery, anguish, iniquity drive many of us to take sides, to engage in conflicts, to preach and teach doctrines denounced by many as subversive and by others as half-baked and fallacious. If logic condemns us, so much the worse for logic!

In truth, logic does *not* condemn us. Professor Dewey himself, in a casual, parenthetic remark in his final chapter, notes that "the means of attaining solutions may not be practically available at a given time." There is the rub. We are today in the midst of a social revolution, and we cannot fold our hands, sit still, and wait for miracles. We have to work and fight for radical changes and readjustments in our economic and social order. Philosophical detachment and heroic devotion to beauty and purity in thought and action are not for us.

Spring

A little miss in colors gay
I saw upon the grass one day.
She tossed her pretty head
And to the birds above she said:
"Collect your choirs and have them sing,
For I have come, and I am Spring."
Then to the earth she whispered low,
"Tell all the flowers, 'tis time to grow."

JOHN WADLINGTON.

On the Pacifist Front

[UNITY will publish from time to time, under this heading, such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. We earnestly invite our readers to send us such items of interest as may come to their attention.—*Editor.*]

XII

The following correspondence has been released at Syracuse, New York:

(a)

Council of Churches,
340 Montgomery St.,
Syracuse, N. Y.
Gentlemen:

I have been requested by Colonel John R. Kelly in charge of Army Recruiting for the Northwestern District of New York State to contact all civic and ecclesiastical organizations to obtain their coöperation in this work. This recruiting is for the purpose of relieving in part the unemployment situation, to give the youth of our country an opportunity to learn a useful occupation, to assist in the National Defense of our country; and in no way a drive for war.

We would like to send speakers to your various bodies and such speakers will be furnished on application to the undersigned or to Colonel Kelly in the Federal Building (telephone 2-5111). Should you desire to have members of your ecclesiastical body give this their attention, we will furnish to you and to each of them proper literature.

May I hope to hear from you?

Yours for the National Defense,
JOSEPH BONDY,
Colonel, Auxiliary Reserve, United States Army.

(b)

Colonel Joseph Bondy,
United States Army,
Federal Building,
Syracuse, N. Y.
My dear Sir:

A few weeks ago the Syracuse Council of Churches received from you a communication requesting coöperation of the ecclesiastical organizations which we represent, in the current drive for recruits in the Army. We earnestly regret having been so long in replying to this request, but we have felt that it should have thorough consideration by our executive committee so that any reply we might make would truly express the opinion of this Protestant body.

Naturally, like yourselves, we are deeply concerned about meeting the problem of unemployment among our youth, and about the welfare of our country in these troubled times. However, recognizing that there necessarily must be divergent opinions as to how this best can be done, we confess that we do not conceive army recruiting to be either the American or the Christian way to meet this problem. There is no precedent in history to show that American democracy must meet its unemployment problem by drawing its youth into the army. To our minds, that, in itself, is one of the preliminary steps to totalitarianism. And certainly increased militarism can never be conceived as the Christian way to help our youth find their places in this day.

We feel, therefore, that both honesty and courtesy demand that we make our position clear to you now. After long and careful thought we are persuaded that our churches cannot again become recruiting centers for a militarist program; though they were in the last War, we do not intend that they shall be again.

Several inescapable truths constrain us to take this position:

1. First, our concern for the national welfare leads us to it. We feel that any concerted drive for army recruiting would only serve further to disturb the mental and emotional equilibrium of the nation which, after all, is our greatest defense in these times.

2. Second, our recognition of the basic American doctrine of separation of church and state brings us to this view. To use the churches to aid army recruiting is, to our minds, a direct violation of this principle.

3. Third, our interpretation of the basic Christian viewpoint will not allow us to aid in recruiting. We humbly conceive our mission as standing for another philosophy and way of life than that of force, and we cannot serve both philosophies at once.

We must repeat that we respect the sincerity of your purpose and are supremely grateful for the America in which we thus can hold divergent views. Though we may disagree on method we certainly agree on the purpose of preserving this heritage.

This letter is sent to you by unanimous vote of the Executive Committee of the Council, convened in regular session.

Sincerely yours,
Lynn J. Radcliffe,
Norman J. Whitney,
Gene E. Bartlett,
Robert H. Smith, Jr.,
for the Council of Churches.

The Welsh Nationalist Party is described by George M. LL. Davies, in *Peace News,* as having renounced all violent methods for its struggle and its opposition to the war, and agreed to follow the tactics of Mahatma Gandhi.

While Mr. Sumner Welles was touring Europe, the United Press sent the following dispatch from London:

Forty-two members of the National Peace Council wrote to Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain today urging that the British government take advantage of the European tour of Sumner Welles, President Roosevelt's personal envoy, to declare its willingness to consider peace proposals from neutrals.

"We are deeply concerned over the possibilities of utilizing Welles' investigation as a starting point in an attempt to find an acceptable basis for negotiations, which should not be minimized," the letter said.

Signatures included those of George Bernard Shaw, Lords Faringdon, Noel-Buxton, Ponsonby and Rochester and George Lansbury. The signers described themselves as the "federation for coördinating the efforts of societies working against war."

"We share the conviction that the difficulties of making peace are likely to increase as the war proceeds, and we feel that no opportunity should be neglected which offers even a remote chance of negotiating a satisfactory settlement before hostilities take a wider course," they wrote.

The Interchurch Council of New Bedford, Mass., has taken a poll of sentiment on the war among church members in that city. Of 1,199 questionnaires returned, 586 voted it their Christian duty to keep the United States out of the present war; 136 were for American participation; 296 voted that in case the nation entered the war it would be their Christian duty to support the decision of the state; 93 stated that they would, in that event, conscientiously object.

The *Independent News,* London, England, publishes a manifesto-appeal issued by the International Workers Front Against War, of which the following is the opening passage:

In the name of the International Workers Front Against War,

In the name of our brothers in all lands, plunged into bloodshed, slavery and death,

In the name of our wives and mothers,

We, workers of Germany, England, France, the Soviet Union, Italy, Spain, Scandinavia, America,

We, the colonial slaves of all parts of the earth,
We declare:
This war is only the continuation of the war of 1914-18.
The victors are trying to hold on to their spoils.
The defeated powers are trying to regain what they have lost.

They fight for the same territories, the same markets, the same raw materials, led by the same old men on whose hands is the blood-guilt of the last war.

All is the same in the new imperialist conflict, except the level of economic resources is far lower now, the level of destructive technique is far higher now, than in 1914.

For these reasons, all of us together, in all tongues proclaim

This is not our war! We demand immediate peace!

This war can accomplish nothing but ruin. It destroys our liberties, our means of livelihood, our lives.

We will not accept such sacrifices for a cause that is not our own. With all our power we will struggle:
In the neutral lands—to keep them out of this war.
In the lands already involved—to force an immediate peace.
WE DEMAND PEACE,

Peace without annexations, without indemnities, without the partition of peoples who wish to remain united, without the subjection of peoples who wish to be free, without the oppression of minorities and colonial lands.

Peace through the right of the peoples freely to decide their own fate.

The *Bulletin* (London) of the International Workers Front Against War prints the following report from Austria:

The state of mind of the great majority of the population can be easily expressed in a few words: opposed to the war. The difficulties in getting foods, accentuated exploitation in the large plants, and the closing of the small factories and shops, have increased the discontent of the working class and petit bourgeoisie. Not long ago the following demonstration took place in Vienna against the war and against the regime. At one of the "information" meetings of the Nazi party in the workers district of Ottakring, the women interrupted the speech of the Nazi leader Krebs by remarking in a loud voice on the difficulties that they had in procuring their food rations. The Nazi orator was forced to break off his speech several times, for he could not make himself heard. Many women were arrested. At the markets of Nasch and the Carmelites, housewives demonstrated because they could get neither eggs nor vegetables. The women formed a procession and cried, waving their empty shopping bags, "We thank our Fuehrer."

While a large number of soldiers were marching from the barracks of Rossau to the Franz-Joseph station, the following demonstration occurred. Members of the Hitler Youth and the League of German Girls were cheering the soldiers as they left for the front with "Heil Hitler" and "Sige-Heil." Suddenly a crowd of invalids from the last war appeared and cheered the soldiers on in the same words. This crowd, made up entirely of men severely mutilated in the last war, was very impressive. The effect on the young soldiers of the sight of all these wounded men and invalids was deep and startling.

In an armament factory of the 20th district, the workers adopted a protest against the non-payment of overtime work. This was forwarded to the German Labor Front. The members of the old shop committee (in the time of the free trade unions) and some other workers were arrested.

When the blackouts occurred, monarchist pamphlets, printed and mimeographed, were slipped into the pockets of passers-by. Recently there have been many arrests and searches again. Those arrested are for the most part old-time trade-union functionaries, monarchists, or members of the Czech colony in Vienna.

Resistance to the war and to the regime is particularly strong among the women; and the most outspoken opposition is heard on the markets and in the food stores. Enthusiasm for the war and for the regime exists only among the youth, including the working-class youth. Strong chauvinism and war spirit predominated at the meetings of the Hitler Youth. In the factories, there are many arguments between young workers, who are in favor of the war, and older workers, who fought in the last one. The events in Bohemia are discussed here in Vienna with great interest. We are always hearing of new demonstrations and of new acts of sabotage on the part of the Czechs. The majority of the population sympathizes with them. Older Nazis say: "It was very silly of us to annex the Czechs. We will not be able to change these people." In the country, the situation is more favorable towards the regime. At Kaernten or in Styria, the Nazis still have a fairly large mass base. In these regions, there is a certain war psychology. This situation also exists in Salzburg, in the Vorarlberg, in Upper Austria and the Burgenland. On the other hand, resistance to the regime is much stronger in the Tyrol and in Lower Austria. In Innsbruch (Tyrol) there have been many arrests of Catholics and monarchists. At Tulln (Lower Austria) there were fights between Catholics and members of the Hitler Youth. A few were wounded and many Catholics were arrested. At Klosternenberg (Lower Austria), members of the local Hitler Youth broke into a convent and beat up the inmates. The following day, peasants from the surrounding regions stood guard before the convent. They were dispersed by the police, and many were arrested. After these incidents, the police took over permanent occupation of the convent.

One of our friends, a citizen of a neutral country, has just returned from Germany where he was in contact mainly with medical circles. He tells us that among the professional classes, discontent against the regime is very widespread. They do not even seem to mind expressing their criticism aloud. Everybody is asking, "Where are they leading us?" and declaring, "This cannot last."

Thirty-seven clergymen on the Pacific coast have issued the following statement in reply to the thirty-three Christian leaders of the East with reference to the present war:

Thirty-three prominent Christian leaders of the East have published a statement with reference to the present war. We salute these men as brethren. But if their statement is meant as an interpretation and criticism of the position which we as Christian pacifists hold, we must express our hearty dissent.

As ministers of the gospel, we the undersigned wish to make our own convictions clear: We do believe that war under any circumstances is unchristian. But we will not admit either "intellectual confusion" or "moral callousness" concerning issues involved in the war. We do "discriminate between belligerents." We do not "ignore the reality of relative but important distinctions between the contending parties."

We recognize that "victory of Germany, Russia, or Japan would inevitably preclude the justice, freedom of thought and worship, and international coöperation which are fundamental to a Christian world order." But we also believe that *security* and *peace* are fundamental to a Christian world order. We cannot forget that justice and security were for years denied the German people by the very governments now fighting Germany and that such a denial gave Hitlerism its opportunity. We question whether a war waged in behalf of justice and security by those who so long denied these values to others is an adequate atonement for such a denial. We seriously doubt whether a military victory by those who denied justice and security to their former enemies will be the prelude to a peace in which justice and security will be enthroned in the international order. Certainly the values of peace itself are now being ruthlessly destroyed by the war which is being waged.

We believe that there is a more Christian method than war for expressing our moral judgments and resisting the evils involved in the present conflict and the world situation which has caused it.

Participation in war would involve us in lies, in hatred, in slaughter, and in an increasingly totalitarian strategy. We do not believe the Kingdom of God demands such weapons or can be defended by them.

The method upon which we would rely is not negative. It is as aggressive and dynamic as the coercion of the cross. Instead of obliging us to lie, hate, and kill, it obliges us while resisting evil to love even those who call themselves our

enemies, to feed and minister to them, and to try to overcome the evil in them with good.

What we propose is a very definite loyalty to all the values of civilization and Christianity, an immovable determination that those values shall be preserved, a willingness to suffer and die for their preservation, a faith that suffering and death, endured rather than inflicted, are the way of the cross but also the way of redemption.

We recognize that "throughout Christian history" the "majority in the churches" have assumed that when they are "convinced that their nation is engaged in resistance to aggression or in defense of international order they must obey its call." But we refuse to believe that any question of ethics is to be decided on the basis of what the "majority in the churches" have assumed in the past. Christians have ever been tardy in understanding and applying the principles of Jesus. We do not assume to be better than our predecessors or our differing contemporaries, but we do believe that the emerging spirit of Jesus leads us to this newer interpretation, which is, after all, only a reaffirmation of the position of the early Christians.

We offer no immediate panacea, but suggest the calling of a world conference of neutral nations, the persistent offer of mediation, the building of machinery for peace so that access to raw materials, markets, and the administration of colonies shall be shared in a democratic spirit. We do not propose a selfish aloofness from the world's tragedy, but affirm that if we follow the way of Jesus we shall not betray the English or the Germans, the Finns or the Russians, the Chinese or the Japanese. We hold ourselves in readiness to make any sacrifice which Christian intelligence demands in behalf of all these peoples.

We bear humble witness to this faith: The way of Jesus with all its risks and demands is a better way to serve one's own or any country than the way of war, which inherently denies the universal fatherhood of God and the highest expression of that fatherhood which is the cross.

Zion's Herald publishes the following:

Announcement has just been made by the Board of Foreign Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church that Rev. J. Holmes Smith of Canton, Ohio, and Professor Paul K. Keene of Madison, N. J., missionaries of the Methodist Church in India, have resigned their posts and are returning to the United States. They have taken this step on the ground of conscientious inability to continue to comply with the declaration that is required by the British Government of every missionary before he is permitted to enter India.

Each India-bound missionary declares that he does "hereby undertake to do nothing contrary to, or in diminution of, the authority of the lawfully constituted Government in the land to which I am appointed." Mr. Smith and Professor Keene, both of whom signed this declaration before entering India, are understood to feel that their sympathy with certain nationalistic movements in India and England's plans for India's part in the present European war call for them to speak and act in a manner that would be contrary to their pledge. Rather than violate this pledge and rather than remain silent, they have chosen to resign.

The Associated Press publishes the following dispatch from Philadelphia:

Traditionally peace-loving Quakers, expressing "sorrow and dismay" because of the European war, sought today to assure younger members of their sect of exemption from conscription in the event the United States becomes involved.

The Philadelphia yearly meeting of Friends, representative assembly of Quaker groups in Maryland, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and most influential of six such meetings in the nation, approved registration of Friends between eighteen and thirty-five "to record their convictions before the arrival of times of abnormal distress consequent upon the declaration of war."

The United Press carries the following dispatch from Birmingham, England:

Delegates representing the National Union of Shop Assistants, Warehouse men, and Clerks declared in a resolution today that the war was an imperialist one in which the working classes had no interest.

Saturday the Essex District Council of the National Union of Railwaymen had demanded that the war be stopped, and C. A. Smith, president of the Independent Labor Party, had advocated a strong anti-war policy.

The union which disapproved of the war today has about 175,000 members. Delegates approved by 82 votes against 57 a resolution which said:

"It is an imperialist war fought for the defense of British and French colonial possessions. The working classes have no interest in supporting it."

The United Press reports the following from Nottingham, England:

The European war is but "another episode in the bloody game of power politics," C. A. Smith said in his presidential address to the National Council of the Independent Labor party today.

"We oppose Chamberlain [Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain] both in peace and war," Mr. Smith said. "While we energetically demand immediate stoppage of the war, we shall equally refuse to support the only conditions of peace which Chamberlain will ever grant voluntarily."

The Associated Press published on Easter Monday last the following dispatch from London:

A well-dressed man in the congregation at St. Paul's Cathedral interrupted Easter services today by shouting, "We want peace. Stop the war." Church officials quietly escorted the man outside.

Last Sunday a youth at the London Church of St. Martins-in-the-Fields interrupted a prayer by shouting, "Pray for peace. Stop the war." He left without further demonstration.

The United Press reports from London that, of 1,270,000 men registered under the English conscription act, 25,801 have been registered provisionally as conscientious objectors.

The United Press reports from London, England:

The Essex District Council of the National Union of Railwaymen adopted a resolution today demanding an immediate end of the war with Germany.

The council condemned the war as imperialistic and contrary to the interest of all workers. It demanded a conference of all nations to determine economic requirements and fulfill them by a fair distribution of raw materials, a plebiscite of minorities as to whether they want to be independent, and an end to all assistance given the "white guards and Fascist rulers of Finland."

Of their own leaders the railwaymen demanded that they end the political truce with the government "and get on with the struggle for Socialism, which alone can bring lasting peace and prosperity to the world, and to fight for freedom for all colonial peoples."

For Valiant Hearts

For valiant hearts we pray, that when we hear
The tumult of the battle coming near,
The panic where men strike, they know not why,
The rout where men are driven forth to die,—
We may not join the serried ranks of fear.
To breast the current in its mad career
Of terror at the stranger, turn deaf ear
To sacred words,—will be adventure high
For valiant hearts!
To cast aside the weight of battle gear,—
To dare to stand alone, with dauntless cheer,—
To pass the old forebodings calmly by—
May we be first the uncharted course to try!
The world has longed too many a trembling year
For valiant hearts!

JESSIE WALLACE HUGHAN.

The Study Table

A Provocative Volume

MAN THE MEASURE. *By Arthur Hazard Dakin.* 284 *pp. Princeton: Princeton University Press.* $3.00.

When a serious thinker presents an honest discussion of a vital problem, even with a definite and frankly stated bias, one hardly feels like writing a negative review. Yet, the truth is that Mr. Dakin starts with a definition of humanism that vitiates his whole argument. Like many another debater, he has gone to the dictionary—that graveyard of symbols—for his definition of humanism. In the unabridged second edition of Webster's New International Dictionary, he finds that humanism is "a contemporary cult or belief calling itself religion but substituting faith in man for faith in God." With all due respect to the traditions of Princeton, one can hardly take seriously a ponderous and elaborately annotated volume based on a dictionary definition. Mr. Dakin owed it to his volume, if not to humanism, to formulate a definition that would at least allow for the varieties of humanism which he himself recognizes. Now, it is true that Comte substituted faith in man—past, present, and to come—for faith in God; it is true that M. C. Otto affirms a positive belief in the non-existence of God; it is true that some humanists are agnostic in regard to God; but it is also true that some humanists hold to belief in various views of God, and that few humanists regard the quest for God as a closed issue. Even a casual perusal of *Humanist Sermons,* (1927), a representative cross section of humanist thought, would have enlightened Mr. Dakin on this matter. Moreover, the kind of faith that any humanist has in man is so different, both quantitatively and qualitatively, from the faith that any theist has in God, that one could hardly be substituted for the other. The whole matrix of psychological attitudes is different. Theistic faith involves the cosmic guaranty of values; and I know of no humanist whose "faith in man" involves such a guaranty.

Mr. Dakin fails to understand that the basic humanist faith is in the sole adequacy of observational inquiry, rational analysis, and experimental tests to produce such dependable beliefs as man may possess. Even the most radical humanists will readily admit that theoretically this process might ultimately validate the God idea; but in the light of present knowledge, most humanists are inclined to believe that the evidence points in other directions. The point of chief concern for my present criticism is that a movement has the right to be met on the ground of its central emphasis and not on one phase of peripheral matters. The central emphasis of humanism is on the scientific method, broadly interpreted, applied to the solution of all problems, including the problem of God. This, Mr. Dakin fails to see.

But perhaps I am laying too much stress on Mr. Dakin's Introduction.

In the first part of the first chapter, dealing with the "Background of Humanism," Mr. Dakin draws conclusions regarding the "kind of people humanists are" from wholly inadequate data; but in the second part of the chapter he strikes a more scholarly stride. The second chapter deals with "American Humanism," and includes a discussion of the Humanist Manifesto. Chapters 3, 4, 5, and 6 discuss humanism in relation to scientific method, psychology, and ethics. The final chapter on "Humanism and Religion" is perhaps the most unsatisfactory of all, for here the author's original fallacy bobs up again when he asserts that humanists are constantly searching for something to take the place of God.

Mr. Dakin closes the book in a somewhat irritable mood, declaring: "Their good, humanists have taken from others and made it no better. Their bad, they have borrowed also and by misuse made it worse." Come, come, Mr. Dakin! You would hardly hold that Christian theism is under no obligations to Hebrew monotheism; or to pagan Platonism, would you? And undoubtedly the theistic modernists have benefitted by the scientific method, which they can hardly claim to have been fostered by theism. If to benefit from many streams of thought and life is to be "parasitic," as Mr. Dakin seems to believe, then the whole of modern life is parasitic, since no movement is without debt to its contemporary culture and its multitudinous past.

The book is an interesting and provocative volume on the level of the sectarian debates of the last century; but not to be taken too seriously.

CURTIS W. REESE.

In Honor of a Great Teacher

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS IN CHRISTIAN HISTORY. *Edited by John T. McNeill, Matthew Spinka, and Harold R. Willoughby.* 417 *pp. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.* $4.00.

This is the testimonial volume presented to Dean Shirley Jackson Case on his retirement from his duties at the University of Chicago Divinity School in 1938. For thirty years Dean Case has labored in the interest of educational discipline in American religion. During that time he has written books, translated others, edited periodicals, and restored to life in 1906 the American Society of Church History which Philip Schaff founded in 1888. Dean Case has labored as untiringly as has William Adams Brown in the effort to make religion appeal to the intellectual life of America. Both these men have been missionaries to the intellectuals. Dean Case was America's pioneer in graduate work in religion. Some theological schools should concentrate on training men for parish work; other theological schools should specialize in training teachers of religion. The old-time seminary tried to do both at the same time and did neither. Up to the advent of the first World War, those who wished to prepare themselves for research and for teaching found it necessary to continue their work in European universities. But Dean Case saw the handwriting on the wall, and began the preparation of graduate work in religion. This prophetic insight into the religious need of American theological education will always be his greatest glory.

The volume prepared to honor Dean Case contains twenty-one research papers dealing with all phases of religion from the forerunner of Jesus, John the Baptist, to the influence on religion of the American Frontier. Space does not permit a digest or even a recital of these excellent articles, but every person who desires to share in the intellectual approach to religion must read and ponder them.

CHARLES A. HAWLEY.

Correspondence

"The Conscientious Objector"

Editor of UNITY:

When an earnest effort is made to show the world the sham and futility of war through a news publication, and that effort receives better nation-wide support than was anticipated, it is inspiring news to other workers for unity and peace.

Toward the end of 1939, the first issue of *The Conscientious Objector* appeared. It was published because it was felt that something more than pacifist pamphlets was needed in the anti-war movement, in view of the day-to-day changes in the European situation and the growing domestic agitation for war. Today the paper is established as an organ of the War Resisters League (National), the New York section of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, and the Peace and Service Committee of the New York Monthly Meeting of Friends (Quakers). Other groups support it by acting as distributing centers.

The aim of the paper is to show the sham and futility of war, to strive for the removal of the causes of war, and to inform and support those who are opposed to all wars.

We have received letters from all parts of the country, from professors and students, workmen and housewives, religious organizations and non-sectarian groups, all congratulating the paper for the good job it is doing in gathering and reporting news of interest to those who are opposed to war.

Readers of UNITY can help make *The Conscientious Objector* a more and more effective organ for peace by doing the following: (1) Order a bundle of each issue to be resold at 3c a copy. We will send you 30 copies for $1.00 (10c covers postage) or 100 copies for $3 (the *C.O.* pays the postage); (2) Send in your own subscription and gift subscriptions at 50 cents for 12 successive issues. (3) Send us news of pacifist activities in your community. (4) Send a contribution, however small, to help us carry on. The editors and others work voluntarily, but there are expenses of mailing, etc., that must be met.

2 Stone St., Room 413, L. DORIS, *Editor-in-chief.*
New York, N. Y.

Faith Proved by Works

Editor of UNITY:

Many thinkers have recoiled from the orthodox churches because of the lack of satisfactory feeling about singing the childish songs and the wishful thinking found there. For the life of them, many people cannot see how the recital of tuneful hymns can have any possible relations to present-day conditions. These people have decided that they must have a religion (if they call it a religion) which has some relation to the present-day world and which can actually effect its mark upon that world.

In terms of effective religion, it is possible to judge the work that a group may be doing by members of its faith. For example, we find that the proportion of names in *Who's Who* belonging to the Unitarian church is far ahead of other groups. Congregationalists come second. Assuming that a name in *Who's Who* is an indication of important daily work, one can judge the actual effectiveness of a religious faith which accepts the idea that religion makes a difference in one's character and relation to the world.

If the older religions left the world unmoved, one can conclude that religion can be an irrelevant auxiliary to life, or that thinkers should make efforts to discover ways and means of discovering a currently effective, creative, and dynamic spiritual faith. If an entirely new start in religious thinking is needed for such an achievement, it may require much agony; but as we were told by Felix Adler, religion has its birth in agony.

CARL PETERSON.
Chicago, Illinois.

From an Old Friend

Editor of UNITY:

. . . I am a member of the Minneapolis Unitarian Church. . . . I have been one of UNITY's constant readers for fifty years, and now in my 81st year look forward to its arrival as eagerly as ever. To me, no other of the various fine periodicals available today completely fills UNITY's place. . . .

MARGARET T. OLMSTEAD.
Excelsior, Minnesota.

Tolerance—and UNITY

Editor of UNITY:

If congratulations are in order, I wish to congratulate you upon being chosen the most "tolerant" man of the year by the American League for Tolerance. . . . I was interested to see that you have filed for safekeeping those words of the First Lady in reference to ministers and war.

I enjoy your magazine, UNITY, and pass it around here at Duke. Lately Kirby Page was here, and made five addresses in the School of Religion. . . . It was a great day, and reminded me so much of the times I have heard you speak and have read your articles. . . .

ERNEST R. BROMLEY.
Durham, North Carolina.

From a French Pacifist

Editor of UNITY:

Is it too late for sending you my very best wishes for health and happiness? But you will excuse me when you know that to the general calamities have been added for me all sorts of family cares and troubles. Still I must congratulate you upon your splendid Armistice Number, which came as a breath of fresh air in a close room. You can suppose what life is like for those of our mind. What you said of my friends (page 129 of issue 8) has been experienced by many of us in a greater or a less degree. And it is not the end! So you may imagine how comforting it is for us to know what others are doing everywhere.

Let us hope mankind will return to sanity before it is too late. The planet itself seems to be disgusted with its inhabitants whom she plagues in all possible ways—earthquakes, unusual colds for us all. Will the lesson be learned soon, I wonder? With my heartiest congratulations, and thanks for your magnificent work.

D.

From a German Refugee

Editor of UNITY:

. . . The other day I brought your paper, UNITY, in class, to speak about it. I am so devoted to liberalism and I do cherish pacifism, and who expresses these noble ideals with more eloquence than you?

In our German ——— Club, a speaker said we should wait for the hour to take revenge, and until then nourish our hatred against the oppressor; and at the St. ——— Church the minister said everybody would be punished who does not follow Christ; but I feel that this is not the thing we are on earth to do. No hatred will do us any good. If there is one thing which can bring redemption, it is to love whenever and wherever we can.

M. L.
New York City, N. Y.

On the Centennial of the United Hebrew Congregation, St. Louis, Mo.

Welcome companions through a hundred years,
We thank our God for those rich gifts you bore
Into the west, as the Ark went before
The Israelites of Old. Even now your seers
Bring us their Jewish courage,—pioneers
In patience, love of beauty, hate of war,
Passion for learning. Should we close the door
To such as you, it's ours should be the tears.

So long we've wronged you! We would make amends.
Thanks for your great; thanks for your men of God,
For Moses, Job, for him of Nazareth—
That matchless Rabbi who would have us friends.
Had we but known him, walked where he has trod,
No hate were ours, but love, even unto death.

—A GENTILE FRIEND.